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ABSTRACT

Online dating continues to grow rapidly in popularity every day, yet few studies have examined the role of personality in online dating behavior. This study was designed to expand previous research and conduct a more comprehensive investigation on how personality traits can be used to predict college students’ online dating behavior. A range of personality dimensions were associated with the actual and preferred use of online dating compared to face-to-face dating behaviors. The current study tested whether socially incompetent individuals would show a greater preference and actual use of online dating compared to face-to-face dating (social compensation hypothesis), whether socially competent individuals would show a higher frequency of dating and a preference for using both online and face-to-face dating (rich-get-richer hypothesis), if individuals high on sociosexuality are more likely to visit websites for casual/sexual purposes supposed to commitment purposes, whereas conscientiousness will show the opposite pattern, and whether openness is positively associated with a high frequency of online dating and a strong desire to use it. The results indicated that participants, including the socially inept ones, all indicated more actual, and a stronger preference for, face-to-face dating compared to online dating, contrary to the author’s hypotheses. There was a significant positive correlation between sociosexual orientation and both actual and preferred use of websites for casual sexual and romantic dating purposes. Outside of these findings, no strong evidence was found to support the role of personality in relation to online dating within the college sample. This study offers implications for online dating companies to better tailor their sites to the needs of potential customers and to understand exactly who is implementing online dating.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, the prevalence of online dating has increased exponentially. Katz and Aspden (1997) estimated that at least 2 million new face-to-face meetings had taken place due to initial participation on the Internet. In 2006, the total number of dating sites across the world increased by 17% within the last year and the United States had the highest increase at 42.9% (Internet Security Systems, 2006). One of the most popular online dating sites, Match.com, asserts that 20,000 singles join their site every day and they receive 27,671,000 monthly visits (“Match.com”, 2010; “TraffitEstimate.com”, 2010). In a recent study, Match.com and Chadwick Martin Bailey found that 1 in 5 single people have dated someone they met using an online dating website (Match.com & Chadwick Martin Bailey). Additionally, online dating is becoming popular among college and graduate students. Donn and Sherman (2002) found that 61.8% of graduate students and 42.1% of undergraduates surveyed knew someone who was involved in a relationship online.

Knowing who tends to use online dating services and why they use them holds important theoretical and practical implications. Previous research in this area has mostly focused on the role of social/dating anxiety in online dating. However, social/dating anxiety is by no means the only relevant personality trait associated with participating in online dating. The author has identified three major benefits of online dating: First, online dating invokes much less anxiety than face-to-face dating, thus offering socially inept individuals an opportunity to compensate one’s social/dating anxiety (Lawson & Leck, 2006). Second, different online dating websites are designed to cater to different people’s relationship needs and desires, therefore allowing people fast access to potential partners that suits their specific relationship goals, for example, the commitment level people desire in a relationship (Lawson & Leck, 2006). Finally, online dating
eliminates geographical restrictions and drastically increases the size of the pool and the likelihood of finding a good match (Lawson & Leck, 2006). Based on these rationales, the author generated a series of hypotheses regarding the associations between a range of personality traits and online dating. Thus the current study is expected to significantly extend previous research by examining a much larger scale of personality dimensions in the investigation of online dating users’ personality profile.

Social Compensation and Online Dating

As Internet use and online dating becomes increasingly popular every day, researchers start to examine the psychological mechanisms underlying online dating. Interestingly, there seems to be an apparent controversy regarding who would more likely utilize this new mode of searching for and meeting new dates. This controversy is evident in two competing hypotheses that Valkenburg and Peter (2007) proposed. The social compensation hypothesis argues that people high in dating or social anxiety, who typically experience difficulties forming relationships in face-to-face interactions, will be more likely to use online dating to compensate for deficits they encounter in the offline world. Since online dating invokes less anxiety, it would allow anxious individuals an opportunity to develop relationships in a less threatening manner (for a review see McKenna & Bargh, 2000). In contrast, the rich-get-richer hypothesis suggests that people low in social anxiety will be more likely to use online dating. Since these people have stronger social and dating skills, they should be equally competent using the Internet as an alternative means of finding a partner to face-to-face meetings.

Although previous research has provided evidence for both of these two hypotheses, overall, more support has been shown for the social compensation hypothesis. McKenna (2008) acknowledged that features such as physical appearance, stigmas, and shyness or social anxiety
often serve as gates in face-to-face interactions, determining whom to let in and whom to keep out. These features are less apparent in online interactions, and therefore are not automatic cause for dismissal. An example of a study in support of the social compensation hypothesis, which also shows that a reduction in these features can be beneficial for certain people, was conducted by Lawson and Leck (2006). The authors conducted a qualitative analysis of interviews of online users showed that one of the most frequently mentioned motivations for online dating was that it eased the fear of face-to-face rejection (Lawson & Leck, 2006). McKenna, Green, and Gleason (2002) assessed social anxiety, loneliness, expression of the real self, the type of relationship formed, the depth of the relationship formed, and the online behavioral actions in a community sample of 568 participants. Their results indicated that those who have higher levels of social anxiety and loneliness and have a difficult time with social interactions use the Internet to express themselves in a way they cannot in face-to-face relationships.

It has also been found that shy people are more likely to use the Internet to develop relationships. Looking at a college sample, Ward and Tracey (2004) administered surveys measuring shyness, interpersonal competence, confidence/anxiety, number of relationships, socially supportive behaviors, and relationship satisfaction. The authors found that individuals high in shyness were more likely to become involved in online relationships. They also found that shyness was associated with greater difficulties in face-to-face relationships compared to online relationships. Additionally, even though shyness was related to increased inhibition in online relationships, it was less than their inhibition in face-to-face relationships, which exemplifies how the use of the Internet can lessen anxiety when forming relationships and help individuals overcome their shyness.
Also providing support for the social compensation hypothesis, Amichai-Hamburger, Wainapel, and Fox (2002) found that neuroticism and introversion were correlated with opening up online. Specifically, they examined to what degree people with different personality traits were able to locate their “real me” in face-to-face and online interactions. The “real me” is what one believes he or she actually is, but is unable to present in normal situations (McKenna et. al, 2002). Using a sample of online chat users from Israel, the authors found that those who scored high on neuroticism and introversion were more likely to locate their “real me” online rather than in face-to-face interactions, while extroverts and non-neurotic people were more likely to locate their “real me” face-to-face. Additionally, McKenna (2008) found that initial online conversations can skip the “icebreaker” topics and go right into personal discussion that would rarely take place so early in a face-to-face meeting. The anonymity of the Internet allows people to explore aspects of themselves they might keep hidden in their existing relationships.

When investigating whether the effects of online dating are positive or negative, McKenna and Bargh (2000) found that anonymity allows Internet daters to take greater risks in disclosing intimate information with others. The authors found that many factors that create feelings of social anxiety in face-to-face interactions are not present online and physical appearances do not prevent the initiation of a relationship. Furthermore, the authors found that anxiety was a strong predictor of who is likely to use the Internet for relationship formation. Specifically, socially anxious people are more likely to form close relationships online than their anxiety-lacking counterparts. Sheeks and Birchmeier (2007) extended the findings of McKenna et al. (2002) in their examination of a college student population. The authors found that those high on shyness and low on sociability reported closer and more satisfying relationships online.
These findings indicate that shy and less sociable individuals may find computer-mediated communication more beneficial than individuals who are more socially competent.

To date only one study has found support for the rich-get-richer hypothesis. Valkenburg and Peter (2007) reported that people who were low in dating anxiety used the Internet to date more often than those who were found to be high in dating anxiety. The authors examined the relationship between dating anxiety and online dating behaviors through an online survey of 367 single Dutch Internet users from the general population. Their results showed that online dating seemed to be more popular among people who rank low in levels of dating anxiety, therefore supporting their rich-get-richer hypothesis.

While some studies have shown support for the rich-get-richer hypothesis and others have shown support for the social compensation hypothesis, still other studies have shown no evidence for either hypothesis. Stevens and Morris (2007) examined the role that dating, social phobia, and social anxiety played in college students’ use of the Internet to meet others. The authors found that individuals with higher levels of anxiety did not differ from their counterparts in the frequency of using the Internet to maintain social relationships. Therefore, their study did not support either hypothesis. However, they did find that individuals with symptoms of social and dating anxiety were more likely to use some specific forms of online media, particularly webcams. Additionally, Peter and Valkenburg (2007) also found dating anxiety, as well as physical self-esteem, to be unrelated to seeking casual online dates. This study will be further explored later in relation to commitment goals.

The results of previous research have been inconsistent. There are several reasons for this inconsistency. First, some studies compared online dating behaviors across individuals high on
anxiety and those low on anxiety while other studies compared online and face-to-face dating behavior within individuals who report dating anxiety. Examining only one group of individuals or one type of dating behavior could lead to inconsistent or misleading results. Therefore, the author believes that a fairer and thorough comparison would be to compare the face-to-face dating behaviors and online dating behaviors within each of the two groups—the high anxiety group and the low anxiety group. In order to address this limitation in previous studies, the current study examined both face-to-face dating and online dating behaviors in high and low anxiety groups. The author predicted that both the social compensation hypothesis and the rich-get-richer hypothesis would receive support, depending on which comparison one is conducting. When the author compared face-to-face dating and online dating behaviors in high anxiety individuals, she expected that they would show greater preferred and actual use of online dating, which would be evidence for the social compensation hypothesis. When the author compared online dating behaviors across high-anxiety and low-anxiety individuals, she expected that the more socially confident low-anxiety individuals would continue to engage in more online dating (as well as face-to-face dating) than high-anxiety individuals, which would be evidence for the rich-get-richer hypothesis.

Another reason for the inconsistent results is the measurement of the two key variables: anxiety and online relationship interactions. Previous studies examined a number of related constructs of anxiety such as social anxiety (anxiety caused by social interaction), dating anxiety (anxiety caused through dating), shyness (fear of expressing one’s true self), loneliness (need for companionship), physical self-esteem (confidence in one’s physical looks), and neuroticism (unnecessary anxiety or obsession). However, no study has differentiated whether these traits play similar or distinct roles in online dating behaviors. With regard to online interactions,
previous studies have examined a variety of online dating behaviors and sampled different online relationship development stages through surveys and open interviews. To address these limitations, the current study differentiated and measured a wide range of constructs related to social (in)competence including Neuroticism (a Big Five personality dimension), dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, social competence, and self-esteem. The author also included two other Big Five dimensions—Extraversion and Agreeableness because these two dimensions are highly relevant to interpersonal behaviors (John & Srivastava, 1999).

**Goal-directed Selection in Online Dating**

Another important motivation for online dating is that online dating and networking websites are usually clearly defined and marketed to serve various specific populations, allowing people to find a potential partner who meets their goals or criteria, whereas information obtained from the traditional face-to-face meeting has much more ambiguity and can be misleading. For instance, when two strangers first meet at a bar, it is not always apparent what the other party’s desired level of commitment in a future relationship is. This is less of an issue in online dating since many websites have clearly established themselves to satisfy individuals with long-term relationship needs or short-term needs. For example, one person might be trying to start a long-term, committed relationship while another person might just be looking for casual dates or sexual encounters. These two people’s goals are not compatible and an online dating website would not list them as a potential candidate for one another. However, if they happened to meet face-to-face, these goals would not be apparent initially.

There has been very little research on the link between personality, relationship goals, and online dating behaviors. One exception was that Peter and Valkenburg’s (2007) study of
people’s casual online dating behaviors. The authors suggest that sexually permissive people may look for casual dates online more frequently than sexually restrictive people. The study was designed to test two hypotheses: the recreation hypothesis suggesting that sexually-permissive people and high sensation-seekers would use the internet more often, and the compensation hypothesis suggesting that online dating would allow people high in dating anxiety and low in physical self-esteem to compensate for this shortfall. Results showed support for the recreation hypothesis but did not support the compensation hypothesis, indicating that their sample was not using the Internet to compensate for deficits they experience in the real (offline) world. Rather, the authors discussed that the non-lonely people communicate more frequently on the Internet than lonely people do and those who scored low on dating anxiety were also more likely to seek casual dates online. As the authors acknowledged in the article, one limitation of this study is that it did not differentiate the personality types of online daters or the websites that are designed to cater to different relationship goals.

In the current study, the author examined the personality profiles of online dating users, specifically what personality traits differentiate causal versus serious online dating. A personality dimension particularly relevant to the use of casual online dating is sociosexuality. Sociosexuality involves a person's willingness to engage in sexual activity with a variety of partners without being in a committed relationship (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Simpson and Gangestad (1991) found that people with unrestricted sociosexual orientations tend to primarily take a short-term mating strategy, whereas people with restricted sociosexual orientation tend to favor long-term mating strategy and desire commitment in their relationships. These two groups of people show significant differences on a number of behaviors. For example, unrestricted individuals are more likely to engage in sex earlier in their relationships, have sexual relations
with more than one partner at a time, and be in relationships that are characterized by less investment, commitment, love, and dependency. Sociosexuality is important to the current study because on one hand, online dating can facilitate connecting with short-term partners for casual sexual relationships; on the other hand, online dating can also help individuals to accomplish a long-term relationship goal, looking for one partner for a serious relationship.

One of the Big Five personality dimensions—Conscientiousness captures how reliable and committed one generally is in work. It also has important implications for relationship functioning (e.g., Watson et al., 2004). However, it is much less sexually focused compared to sociosexuality. It was interesting to test whether they contribute differently to people’s choices of various online dating websites. The author thus included both sociosexuality and conscientiousness in our investigation.

The present study expanded on this past research on the goals of online dating and examined who participates in online dating, depending on their personality and commitment goals. The author hypothesized that different personalities and mating strategies will be an important determinant of casual or committed relationship goals. Specifically, I expected that restricted and conscientious individuals would look for a serious commitment, while unrestricted and less conscientious individuals would seek casual encounters.

Wider Selection and Online Dating

A major attraction that online dating has for many people is the wide array of people one can find on Internet dating sites. This allows a far better chance for people to find a satisfying partner simply because online dating eliminates the geographical restriction in face-to-face dating and infinitely increases the size of the pool of potential partners. For example, Match.com
suggests that their site is like a Baskin-Robbins’ because they have over 31 “varieties” of people to choose from ("Match.com", 2010). That might be an understatement. Dating websites not only have members from every race and culture but they also offer a variety of personalities and interests that a small community might lack. Conversely, even if there is a plethora of interest groups in one’s community that one can relate too, one might not have time to attend group gatherings (McKenna, 2008). In a study examining the dynamics of Internet dating, Lawson and Leck (2006) conducted in-depth interviews and participant observations to explore motivations of daters. When asked why they use online dating, one participant reported, “It’s easier to meet people. The numbers are up, right? Especially in a small place like where I live” (Lawson & Leck, 2006, p.193). The authors concluded that the participants reported using online dating to reach a larger amount of potential dates and having the freedom to choose among the potentials candidates, which often cannot be found in someone’s daily encounters.

The opportunity that online dating offers to meet larger pools of people could be very instrumental in seeking a compatible partner. Especially for people who come from a small town or people that live in homogeneous communities where they do not have a lot of candidates to choose from, the Internet is a great resource. This is very true for many college campuses since they provide a quite homogeneous environment where many college students have highly similar looks and interests and engages in similar activities. This can severely restrict college students’ partner choice. Online dating offers a great avenue to meet people outside the ivory tower. It is conceivable that individuals with an open mind are more likely to accept this new mode of dating and use it to expand their pool of selection. The author therefore hypothesized that the more open a person is, the more likely he/she will be willing to experiment with an unconventional method of finding a partner and try online dating. To the best of our knowledge, no previous research has
explored the association between openness and online dating. In the current study the author sought out to test the role of openness in college students' participation in online dating.

The Current Study

The goal of the current study was to conduct a much more comprehensive study to examine who prefers and participates in online dating. I examined a spectrum of personality traits to clarify the role of different personality traits in online dating. The personality assessment includes measures assessing the Big Five personality factors, social anxiety, dating anxiety, and sociosexual orientation. I also measured participants’ actual and desired use of online dating. The current study tested the following hypotheses:

H1: I would find evidence for both the social compensation hypothesis and the rich-get-richer hypothesis in a college sample. Specifically:

H1a: Participants high in dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism would show a stronger preference and more frequent actual use of online dating compared to face-to-face dating, which supports the compensation hypothesis.

H1b: Participants low in social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem would show a stronger preference and more frequent use of online dating over face-to-face dating, which supports the compensation hypothesis.

H1c: Participants’ dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism would be negatively associated with the preferred and actual use of online dating and face-to-face dating, which supports the rich-get-richer hypothesis.
H1d: Participants’ social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem would be positively correlated with the preferred and actual use of both face-to-face and online dating, which will serve as evidence for the rich-get-richer hypothesis.

H2: College students’ online dating behavior would be contingent on their specific relationship goals, either to find commitment or for casual encounters.

   H2a: Participants’ sociosexuality scores would correlate positively with online dating behaviors for casual/sexual purposes and correlate negatively with online dating for romance/commitment purposes.

   H2b: Conscientiousness would show the opposite pattern to sociosexuality. Specifically, conscientiousness scores would correlate negatively with casual online dating and would correlate positively with online dating for romantic goals.

H3: Participants’ openness score would be positively correlated with the actual and desired use of online dating.
METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 384 students recruited from University of North Carolina Wilmington undergraduate psychology classes. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 36 years old ($M = 18.96, SD = 1.79$). Five participants were removed from statistical analysis for showing zero variance in their responses on the 32-item Online Dating and Perception survey. The final sample size was 379, consisting of 104 males (27.4%), 272 (71.8%) females, and 3 participants who did not report their gender. The majority (92.3%) of the participants reported their ethnicity as Caucasian, while other reported ethnicities included African-American/Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Latino or Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and Arabic. The majority (95.3%) of the participants identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual, 1.6% reported being homosexual, and 2.6% reported being bisexual. Most (78%) of the participants identified their religious beliefs as Christian, followed by 9% reporting that they were undecided and 7.9% reporting that they were either Agnostic or Atheist. Finally, the sample consisted of 64.1% of members from the freshman class, 17.7% from the sophomore class, 11.1% from the junior class, and 6.6% from the senior class. Participants signed up for the study titled “Dating Experience” using the online Research Participation System located on the University’s website. After signing up, participants were directed to the current study’s online survey. Before the study began, all participants gave consent agreeing to the terms and conditions of the study. After completing the study, the participants automatically received research credit in their psychology class through the research system.
Measures

The online survey included a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix A), the Big Five Personality survey (see Appendix B), the Dating Anxiety Scale-Adolescents (DAS-A, see Appendix C), selected subscales from the Social Skills survey (see Appendix D), an Attachment scale (see Appendix E), a Self Esteem scale (see Appendix F), the Sociosexual Orientation Scale (see Appendix G), and the Dating Attitude and Perception survey developed for this study (see Appendix H).

Demographics. A demographic questionnaire was used to obtain background information from the participants regarding sex, age, ethnicity, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, relationship status, and their current relationship length, if applicable.

Big Five Personality. The 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999; Srivastava, 2010) was used to assess participants’ general personality. The BFI contains 8-item scales assessing Neuroticism and Extraversion, a 10-item Openness scale, and 9-item measures of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Example items are: “is talkative” (Extraversion), “worries a lot” (Neuroticism), “has a forgiving nature” (Agreeableness), “is a reliable worker” (Conscientiousness), “likes to reflect, play with ideas” (Openness). Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which each item is descriptive of them on a 5-point scale ranging from disagree strongly to strongly agree. Alphas ranged from .78 to .86.

Dating anxiety. The 26-item Dating Anxiety Scale for Adolescents (Glickman & La Greca, 2004) was used to measure dating anxiety. Example items are: “I am usually nervous going on a date with someone for the first time,” “I feel confident in dating situations,” and “I worry that I may not be attractive to people of the opposite sex.” Scores were averaged such that
higher scores indicate higher levels of dating anxiety. Responses were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all characteristic of me) to 5 (Extremely characteristic of me). Alphas ranged from .80 to .92.

**Social skills.** The Social Skills Inventory (Riggio, 2002) includes 90 items designed to measure verbal and non-verbal social competence as well as emotional intelligence. I used the three subscales assessing social competence: Social Expressivity, Social Sensitivity, and Social Control. Each subscale is composed of 15 items. Some example items are: “I enjoy going to large parties and meeting new people,” “I consider myself a loner,” and “I’m generally concerned about the impression I’m making on others.” Responses were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all like me) to 5 (Exactly like me). Alphas ranged from .71 to .82.

**Adult attachment.** Participants completed a 16-item short version of Brennan, Clark, and Shaver’s (1998) 36-item attachment measure, which yields scores on the dimensions of Anxiety and Avoidance. Participants used a 7-point scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree) to indicate how they typically feel and behave in their romantic relationships. Alphas were .86 for Avoidance and .77 for Anxiety.

**Self-esteem.** Participants rated themselves on the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) using a 5-point scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree). Alpha was .90.

**Sociosexual Orientation Scale.** The 7-item Sociosexual Orientation Scale (SOI, Simpson & Gangestad, 1991) was used to measure mating strategies. People who score low on the SOI generally require commitment before they engage in sexual relations while people who score high generally do not require commitment. For questions dealing with behavior, participants
were instructed to write in their response in the blank space provided. For questions dealing with thoughts and attitude, participants were instructed to indicate their level of agreement on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (I strongly disagree) to 9 (I strongly agree). Some examples of questions include: “With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) within the past year?” and “Sex without love is OK.” Alpha was .86.

**Dating attitude and perception survey.** This 48-item survey was developed for the current study to measure the participants’ actual use, preferences, and their attitudes and perceptions of online dating. To clarify the survey questions, online dating is operationally defined as making contact and communicating over the Internet, with the possible intentions of meeting face-to-face and starting a romantic or sexual relationship later on. The survey includes 12 items that measure actual use, 10 items that measure preference, and 32 items that measure attitudes and perceptions of online dating. The participants were instructed to answer some frequency items, such as, “How many dates do you go on per week?” For other questions, the participants filled in a bubble indicated either “Yes” or “No”. An example of this type of questions is, “Have you ever used the Internet to meet a potential date?” The participants indicated frequency of an online or face-to-face activity on a scale from 1 (Never) to 7 (Several times/week). An example of this type of questions is, “Please indicate how frequently you use each of the following websites to meet people for potential sexual purposes.” For these questions the author provided a series of websites listed such as Facebook, MySpace, Lavalife.com, Craigslist, Chat rooms, and eHarmony. Finally, participants indicated their agreement with a list of 32 statements regarding attitudes and perceptions of online dating on a scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Example items include: “I can prescreen for certain characteristics online,” “I fear face-
to-face rejection,” and “I think the Internet is a great place to find someone to be in a relationship with.”
RESULTS

*Testing evidence for the social compensation hypothesis: Did socially incompetent individuals use online dating more and prefer it over face-to-face dating?*

To test Hypotheses 1a and 1b, a ± 1 standard deviation split was performed to separate out the participants who scored relatively high on dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism, and low on social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem. A series of repeated measures t-tests were conducted on the groups’ preferences and actual uses of online versus face-to-face dating. Results were expected to indicate that overall, those high on dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism, and low on social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem would prefer and engage in more online dating over face-to-face dating. Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and t scores for actual face-to-face and online dating frequencies in socially incompetent individuals. Table 2 presents this same information for preferred face-to-face and online dating frequencies in socially incompetent individuals. All t-tests proved to be significant at .01, suggesting the opposite of what the authors predicted. Significantly more participants high in dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism and low on social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem engaged in more face-to-face dating and indicated a stronger preference for face-to-face dating in comparison to online dating.
Table 1

*Actual face-to-face and online dating frequency in socially incompetent individuals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Face-to-face Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Online Mean (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High scorers on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating anxiety</td>
<td>2.56 (1.46)</td>
<td>1.25 (.77)</td>
<td>6.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>2.93 (1.48)</td>
<td>1.33 (.99)</td>
<td>7.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.88 (1.44)</td>
<td>1.21 (.78)</td>
<td>8.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low scorers on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.61 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.28 (.75)</td>
<td>7.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.07 (1.37)</td>
<td>1.41 (.94)</td>
<td>9.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>2.79 (1.45)</td>
<td>1.49 (1.06)</td>
<td>5.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skill</td>
<td>2.42 (1.40)</td>
<td>1.20 (.68)</td>
<td>5.75**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 53 to 70. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
Table 2

*Preferred face-to-face and online dating frequency in socially incompetent individuals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Face-to-face</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High scorers on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating anxiety</td>
<td>3.35 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.34 (.92)</td>
<td>11.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment anxiety</td>
<td>3.79 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.36 (1.04)</td>
<td>11.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>3.55 (1.29)</td>
<td>1.26 (.88)</td>
<td>12.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low scorers on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.33 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.48 (1.13)</td>
<td>9.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.30 (1.36)</td>
<td>1.37 (.97)</td>
<td>9.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>3.16 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.18)</td>
<td>8.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skill</td>
<td>3.44 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.27 (.85)</td>
<td>11.17**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 53 to 70. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. **p < .01, * p < .05*
Testing evidence for the rich-gets-richer hypothesis: Were socially competent individuals more likely to engage in online and face-to-face dating than incompetent individuals?

To test Hypotheses 1c and 1d, Pearson correlations were computed to relate the preferred and actual uses of face-to-face and online dating to seven personality dimensions. Dating anxiety, neuroticism, and attachment anxiety were expected to have a negative correlation with the preferred and actual use of online dating and face-to-face dating. Social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem scores were expected to be positively associated with the use of each of the two dating approaches.

Table 3 shows the correlations between the social incompetence dimensions (i.e., dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism) and the actual and preferred use of both face-to-face and online dating behavior. A small yet significant negative correlation was found between dating anxiety and face-to-face dating and a small yet significant positive relationship was found between attachment anxiety and the average time spent participating in online dating. All other correlations were not significant, lending little support for Hypothesis 1c.
Table 3

Correlations between anxiety variables (dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism) and dating behaviors and preferences (face-to-face dating and online dating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating Activity</th>
<th>Dating Anxiety</th>
<th>Attachment anxiety</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 368 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
Table 4 shows the correlations between the social competence dimensions (e.g., extraversion, agreeableness, social competence, and self-esteem) and actual and preferred use of both face-to-face and online dating behavior. Small yet significant positive correlations were found between extraversion and actual face-to-face dating, social competence and actual face-to-face dating, and agreeableness and actual online dating. Small but significant negative correlations were found between extraversion and the preferred frequency of online dating, self-esteem and preferred frequency of online dating, and agreeableness and online dating participation. Overall, the correlations are quite small in magnitude, suggesting that these personality dimensions did not have a significant association with either face-to-face or online dating.
Table 4

Correlations between social competence variables (extraversion, agreeableness, social skill, and self-esteem) and dating behaviors and preferences (face to face dating and online dating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating Activity</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Social Skill</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 368 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05
Did college students visit online dating websites to meet their specific relationship goals?

To test Hypothesis 2a, Pearson correlations were computed between scores on the Sociosexuality Orientation Scale and the total frequency of utilizing the 15 websites listed in the survey for casual sex and romantic relationship purposes. Participants with unrestricted sociosexual orientations were expected to be more likely to use websites to facilitate seeking casual sexual encounters. Therefore positive correlations were expected between the sociosexuality score and the use of websites to find casual sexual partner. Unrestricted participants were predicted to less likely visit sites for romantic relationship purposes. Therefore negative correlations were expected between sociosexuality and use of these websites to find a romantic partner. Table 5 shows significant, positive, and moderate-size correlations between sociosexual orientation and both actual and preferred use of online websites for casual sexual and romantic dating purposes (ranging from .16 to .27).

To test hypothesis 2b, the conscientiousness scores were correlated with the use of the types of websites mentioned above. Negative correlations were expected between conscientiousness and the use of websites to find casual sexual partners, whereas positive correlations were expected between conscientiousness and the use of websites to find a romantic partner. As show in Table 5, significant, negative, and small-size correlations were found between conscientiousness and the preferred use of both casual and romantic dating websites; however, no significant correlation was found between conscientiousness and the actual use of these types of websites.
Table 5

*Correlations between conservative variables (sociosexuality and conscientiousness) and dating behaviors and preferences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating Intentions</th>
<th>Sociosexual Orientation</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Sex</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Sex</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 376 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
Do open individuals visit online dating more often and prefer to do so more often?

To test hypothesis 3, openness scores were correlated with the actual frequency of online dating and preferences for online dating. Positive correlations were anticipated; that is, high openness scores were expected to be positively correlated with more frequent participation in online dating. As shown in Table 6, none of the correlations are larger than .05 indicating no relationship between openness and the actual or preferred use of online or face-to-face dating.
Table 6

*Correlations between Openness and Actual dating behaviors and preferences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating Activity</th>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 368 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
Does the Dating Attitudes and Perceptions Survey yield results in line with what we found regarding personality and dating behavior?

Because we did not find strong associations between personality variables and online dating behavior, we examined the data from the Dating Attitudes and Perceptions Survey and further explored the relationship between personality and attitudes and perceptions regarding online dating. We first conducted a factor analysis to find out the underlying factors of dating attitudes and perceptions. We performed a principal component analysis of the thirty-two statements. The scree test supported a two-factor solution because among the eight factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1, the first two factors’ eigenvalues were distinctively larger than the remaining six factors (the eight factors’ eigenvalues were 9.210, 3.274, 1.947, 1.711, 1.443, 1.291, 1.117, and 1.060, respectively). We then rotated the component matrix using the varimax method. Ten items were removed because they either had an extremely low loading (< .30) on the target factor or had an equally strong loading on both factors. Finally we examined the remaining twenty two items on conceptual grounds. The authors selected items considered essential to the content domain of attitude or perceptions of online dating.

The final scale thus consisted of sixteen items: ten items representing attitudes towards online dating and six assessing perceptions of online and face-to-face dating. The attitude factor encompasses how people feel about online dating, for example, “I think the Internet is a great place to find someone to be in a relationship with” and “I think using the Internet to meet dates is strange”. The perception component represents drawbacks of face-to-face dating and benefits of online dating, for example, “I fear face-to-face rejection”, and “I can prescreen for certain characteristics online”. The two factors explained a total of 53% of the variance in the sixteen items. The correlation between the two factors was only .12, suggesting that just because
participants acknowledge the drawbacks of face-to-face dating and can see the benefits of online
dating does not mean they necessarily have a favorable attitude towards online dating.

Next, we computed Pearson correlations to see how the attitudes and perceptions related
to actual and preferred dating behaviors. As Table 7 shows, a strong, significant, positive
correlation was found between attitude and the “online ever” variable (previous online dating
use). Significant, positive correlations with moderate size were also found between attitude and
both actual and preferred average time spent online dating and preferred frequency of online
dating. This suggests that when participants had a more favorable attitude toward online dating,
they tended to engage in more frequent online dating, spent more time participating in online
dating, and also preferred to do this more often and spend more time doing online dating.

Perception was only found to be negatively correlated with actual face-to-face dating but not
with any other actual and preferred dating behaviors. This indicates that participants who saw
drawbacks to face-to-face dating engaged in less face-to-face dating; however, they did not
necessarily do more online dating. Thus, attitude was a stronger predictor of online dating than
perception was.
Table 7

*Correlating attitudes and perceptions of online dating with dating behaviors and preferences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating Activity</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 368 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
The authors also computed Pearson correlations to examine how attitude and perception related to casual and romantic online dating behavior. Table 8 presents these results. We found significant, positive, substantial correlations between attitude and all four variables: both actual and preferred casual sexual and romantic online dating behaviors. These results suggest that the more positive people feel about online dating, the more they might engage in and prefer to do online dating to fulfill both casual and romantic dating goals. Perception only had one significant, positive correlation with the preference for romantic dating online, indicating that people who perceive fears in face-to-face dating and benefits of online dating might desire to participate in romantic dating online.
Table 8

*Correlating attitudes and perceptions of online dating with actual and preferred use of websites for different purposes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Sex</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Sex</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 376 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
Lastly, Pearson correlations were conducted to test if there is a relationship between the two factors and personality traits. This was important to consider because our previous findings indicated that personality did not play a major role in online dating, which was contradictory to the findings in previous literature. Due to this contradiction, the authors wanted to examine the relationship between personality and how college students perceive and feel about online dating more closely. Several significant correlations were found ranging from small to moderately strong.

We first examined the correlations between the four social competence traits and the two factors (See table 9). Extraversion, agreeableness, self-esteem, and social skills had significant negative but small correlations with attitude, but much stronger negative correlations with perception with the exception of agreeableness. These results indicate that people high on social competence traits (i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, self-esteem, and social skills) have less favorable attitude toward online dating and perceive less fear in face-to-face dating and see online dating as less beneficial. The three anxiety related traits (neuroticism, attachment anxiety, and dating stress) all had moderate to strong significant positive correlations with perception but none of the traits were significantly correlated with attitude. This suggests that anxious participants were able acknowledge fears with face-to-face dating and could see the benefits of online dating; however, they did not necessarily have a favorable attitude towards online dating.

Next we examined the results for conscientiousness and sociosexuality. Conscientiousness had significant but small, negative correlations with both attitude and perception, while sociosexuality had a significant moderate, positive correlation with attitude but a significant, small negative correlation with perception. These results indicate that the more conscientious an individual is, the less favorable their attitude and perception of online dating.
might be. Regarding sociosexuality, sexually unrestricted individuals (i.e., high on sociosexuality) tend to have more favorable attitude towards online dating and experience less fear in face-to-face dating. Finally, openness was not significantly correlated with either attitude or perception. This supports the finding that was previously discussed which indicated that openness is not related to online dating.
Table 9

*Correlating attitudes and perceptions of online dating with personality traits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Anxiety</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating stress</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociosexuality</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 376 to 379. ** p < .01, * p < .05*
DISCUSSION

The current study provides a more comprehensive assessment of who prefers and participates in online dating within a college sample. Specifically, a spectrum of personality traits were examined to clarify the role that personality has in online dating and preferences for uses of online dating were investigated as well. Previous research has shown that certain personality traits, such as extraversion and anxiety, are linked to people’s preferences for online or face-to-face dating and the current study sought out to explore this topic both more broadly and in greater depth.

According to the social compensation hypothesis, people who are high in dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism and are low in social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem are expected to date less frequently overall and be more inclined to participate in online dating. According to the rich-gets-richer hypothesis, participants low in dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism and high in social competence, extraversion, agreeableness, and self-esteem are expected to engage in more frequent overall dating, both face-to-face and online, and prefer to do so more frequent in both forms of dating.

While previous research has found support for the social compensation hypothesis, the current study found no support. The current results indicated that individuals high in anxiety and lacking social skills reported a significantly greater use of and preference for face-to-face dating. This finding was quite interesting, since many previous studies did in fact report findings in support of the social compensation hypothesis. As reviewed by McKenna & Bargh (2000), online dating evokes less anxiety and allows individuals to develop relationships in a less anxiety-evoking environment. Additionally, Lawson and Leck (2006) found that the most
frequently mentioned motivation behind their participants’ use of online dating was to ease the fear of face-to-face rejection. Several other studies discovered similar results in regard to the anxiety-reducing effects of utilizing online dating, so why were similar results not found in the current study’s college sample? The authors attribute the current study’s lack of support for the social compensation hypothesis to idea that college students are forced to interact with each other in so many different domains that this may serve to buffer their social anxiety and oblige them to meet new people when they might not do so outside of a college context. Even if they are dating less than their socially outgoing peers, they are still pushed into social interactions. When they constantly have to interact with and talk to their peers, it could serve as a driving force to form relationships and eliminate the need to turn to online dating to help them with this.

To test the rich-gets-richer hypothesis, the authors predicted that participants’ dating anxiety, attachment anxiety, and neuroticism would be negatively associated with the preferred and actual use of both online and face-to-face dating, while extraversion, agreeableness, social skill, and self-esteem would have positive associations. Our results showed most of the correlations between social competence dimensions and dating were insignificant and had negligible sizes. Therefore, very little support was found for the rich-get-richer hypothesis within the college sample.

Although there is not an abundance of past research in support of the rich-get-richer hypothesis, the current study’s lack of substantial support for the hypothesis in regard to online dating specifically was still intriguing to the authors. Valkenburg and Peter (2007) found that those low in dating anxiety used the Internet to date more often than those high in dating anxiety. Why was this pattern not found in a college sample? In pondering this contradiction, the authors considered that it might be attributed to the notion that extraverted and socially skilled college
students do not take online dating into consideration because they are presented with so many opportunities to utilize their skills to form new relationships. Between classes, school interest groups, sporting events, and parties, socially competent college students already have an abundance of opportunities to form relationships without going online to do so. It would be interesting to re-explore these hypotheses later in time after online dating has continued to grow in popularity amongst younger generations.

In examining H2, SOI scores were found to correlate positively with casual dating behaviors. However, SOI scores also correlated positively with romantic dating behaviors, providing mixed support for H2a. Likewise, conscientiousness scores were found to correlate negatively with the preferred use of casual and romantic dating websites, also providing mixed evidence for H2b. Additionally, no significant correlations emerged between conscientiousness and the actual use of the two types of websites.

These findings contradict those of Peter and Valkenburg (2007) who found that sexually permissive people might look for casual dates online more frequently. While the current study’s unrestricted members of the sample did correlate with causal dating behaviors, they also correlated with romantic dating behaviors. Perhaps this can be attributed to different relationship goals among the different sample populations. Conceivably, it is possible that college students simply have less restricted sociosexual orientations overall, regardless of the type of relationship they are looking for. In regard to why conscientiousness scores correlated negatively with the preference of using causal and romantic dating sites, our speculation is that conscientious individuals’ strong work ethic transfers onto being less focused on finding a partner and more focused on school and work. Or perhaps they are very committed within their already formed relationships and do not feel the need to use online dating to form new relationships. Since
conscientiousness has not been examined in past research, it remains a question whether different result would emerge in a non-college sample.

Lastly, no relation was found between openness and the actual or preferred use of online or face-to-face dating, showing no support for H3. This indicates that openness shows no relation to online dating within a college sample. Although Couch and Liamputtong (2008) found indications that one’s openness to diversity might play a role in online dating behavior, no previous studies have directly looked into the role that the personality characteristic of openness plays in dating behavior to serve as a comparison for this study. One explanation for this lack of support could be because college students are all so involved with and open to the use of the Internet that rating high on openness would not make them more likely to try online dating, they might need some type of other motivation to engage in it. Many college students are also open to trying new things, such as participating in school events, so they do not need to use online dating to meet new people. In future research it might be interesting to measure college students’ openness in regard to other areas of their college life such as participation in interest groups and school events.

Through examining the current studies hypotheses, no strong evidence was found to support the idea of personality types playing a role in college students’ online dating behavior. Overall, participants’ sociosexuality or their mating goals seemed to be more important than personality in predicting their participation in online dating. However, further examining the Dating Attitude and Perception survey offered some interesting insight to explain the mixed evidence compared with previous literature.
The first major result found through examining the Dating Attitude and Perception survey was that the two factors, attitude and perception, are not highly correlated, which tells us that they are in fact measuring different components. Next we found that those who are socially competent do not show much fear of face-to-face dating and as a result, they might not favor online dating as much because they do not need it to compensate for social ineptitude. Contrary, our third main finding was that socially incompetent people do indicate fears in face-to-face dating, however, that does not necessarily make them favor online dating more than their socially competent peers. Fourth, we established that conscientiousness and openness did not predict online dating attitude, perception, and behavior very well. Finally, we discovered that sexually unrestricted individuals indicated less fear in face-to-face dating and more favorable attitudes towards online dating. Sociosexuality was found to be one of the strongest predictors of online dating use.

It seems as though with a college sample, even if the participants recognize the drawbacks of face-to-face dating and see the benefits of online dating, they still might not want to participate in dating via the Internet. At least within the current study’s sample, anxiety (including neuroticism, dating anxiety, attachment anxiety) and online dating seem to be separate issues. Nevertheless, our finding replicates previous literature indicating that socially inept individuals do have fears involving face-to-face dating interactions and can see the benefits of online dating, but it does not mean that they will participate in online dating because of this. Evidence was also found for a stronger relationship between personality factors and attitudes towards and perceptions of online dating than the hypotheses results indicated. Despite this relationship, there is no indication that personality influences the actual behavior to participate in online dating.
One explanation for the reason that socially inept college students might not necessarily use the Internet for dating is the notion that anxiety might carry over to all forms of dating, whether it be face-to-face or online. A potential explanation for the lack of a relationship between personality and the actual use of online dating could be the environment that college students are in which is different from the majority of the population. Perhaps since college students are encircled by so many eligible peers, personality characteristics and dating goals do not cause a need to look for casual or romantic partners outside of the campus and surrounding community. Another possibility could be that online dating is too novel to the college student population to be able to identify consistent patterns. While many older adult age groups have been participating in online dating for years, college students have starting to explore dating options via the Internet more recently. Once again, it would be interesting to conduct a study similar to the present one in a few years to examine if additional exposure to online dating might change college students’ dating habits and find whether a correlation between personality traits and online dating would emerge.

The notion that online dating might be a new concept for college students is also considered a limitation of the current study. The possible lack of exposure college students have to online dating might have caused the data to result in mixed findings compared to the previous literature which sampled older populations. Another possible limitation is the fact that it was self-report. However, hopefully this detail did not influence participants’ responses because the surveys were all taken online and could be completed in private if the participant so desired. Then again, the fact that the surveys were administered online could be a potential limitation because it might have drawn in participants who already favor the use of the Internet, but
considering the lack of evidence for a relationship between personality and online dating, this does not seem to be a problem in the present study.

Although no overwhelming support was found, the current study does offer some important future implications. The findings from the study and the studies discussed throughout the introduction provide extremely valuable information for market research companies. Knowing the goals and demographics of their clientele is essential for online dating companies to maintain a flourishing website. Being able to better understand the types of people who are participating in online dating and what they are looking for will allow online dating websites to better tailor their sites to meet the needs of their clients. Additionally, it is very important on a cultural level to understand current societal trends. Having a grasp on trends as influential as Internet use is in today’s society can have major implications for how information is presented and money is invested. Furthermore, perception seems to be a stronger predictor of online dating use than personality it. Why perception is such a strong determinant and what predicts attitudes about online dating remains to be investigated and could be an insightful direction for future research.
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**APPENDIX A**

*Demographic survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your sex:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Your age:</th>
<th>___________ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your current class standing:
- O Freshman
- O Sophomore
- O Junior
- O Senior

Your primary ethnic identity:
- O African-American/Black
- O non-Indian Asian or Pacific islander
- O Caucasian
- O Latino or Hispanic
- O American Indian or Alaskan Native
- O Arabic
- O Other

Your current religious affiliation:
- O Christian
- O Jewish
- O Islam
- O Buddhism
- O Agnostic or Atheist
- O Undecided
- O Other

Your primary sexual orientation:
- Heterosexual (straight)
- Homosexual (Gay/Lesbian)
- Bisexual (like both men and women)
- O
- O
- O
**APPENDIX B**

**Big Five Personality survey**

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please bubble in the appropriate number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I See Myself as Someone Who . . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tends to find fault with others</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is sometimes rude to others</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has an assertive personality</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is original, comes up with new ideas</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perseveres until the task is finished</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is helpful and unselfish with others</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can be somewhat careless</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tends to be quiet</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is relaxed, handles stress well</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prefers work that is routine</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Starts quarrels with others</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Remains calm in tense situations</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. Has a forgiving nature
18. Likes to reflect, play with ideas
19. Is sometimes shy, inhibited
20. Likes to cooperate with others
21. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
22. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature
23. Tends to be lazy
24. Is talkative
25. Is inventive
26. Is depressed, blue
27. Can be cold and aloof
28. Is reserved
29. Can be moody
30. Can be tense
31. Worries a lot
32. Is full of energy
33. Does things efficiently
34. Is a reliable worker
35. Is easily distracted
36. Is outgoing, sociable
37. Does a thorough job
38. Is generally trusting
39. Gets nervous easily
40. Tends to be disorganized
41. Has few artistic interests
   O O O O O O
42. Has an active imagination
   O O O O O O
43. Is curious about many different things
   O O O O O O
44. Makes plans and follows through with them
   O O O O O O
APPENDIX C

Dating Anxiety Scale-Adolescents

This is not a test; there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer each item as honestly as you can. Read each item carefully, and decide how much the statement is characteristic or true of you.

Show HOW MUCH something is true of you, by using the following scale:

1 = Not at all characteristic of me  
2 = Slightly characteristic of me  
3 = Moderately characteristic of me  
4 = Very characteristic of me  
5 = Extremely characteristic of me

1. I am usually nervous going on a date with someone for the first time.  
2. I am often afraid I may look silly or foolish while on a date.  
3. I worry that I may not be attractive to people of the opposite sex.  
4. It takes me a long time to feel comfortable when I am in a group of both males and females.  
5. I enjoy dating.  
6. I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make while on a date.  
7. It is difficult for me to relax when I am with a member of the opposite sex who I do not know very well.  
8. I think I am too concerned with what members of the opposite sex think of me.  
9. I feel nervous in dating situations.  
10. I often feel nervous when talking to an attractive member of the opposite sex.  
11. I love to go to parties.  
12. I tend to be quieter than usual when I’m with a group of both males and females.  
13. I feel tense when I’m on a date with someone I don’t know very well.  
14. I often worry that the person I have a crush on won’t think very much of me.  
15. I love meeting new people.  
16. I often feel nervous or tense in casual get-togethers in which both guys and girls are present.  
17. I am concerned when I think that a date is forming a negative impression of me.  
18. I feel confident in dating situations.  
19. I become tense and jittery when I feel that someone of the opposite sex is checking me out.  
20. I am frequently afraid that the person I have a crush on will notice my flaws.  
21. Parties often make me anxious and uncomfortable.  
22. I often worry about what kind of impression I am making on members of the opposite sex.  
23. I am afraid that the person I am dating will find fault with me.  
24. I am more shy with someone of the opposite sex.  
25. I think that most people find me to be attractive.  
26. I worry what my date will think of me even when I know it doesn’t make any difference.
APPENDIX D

Social Skills survey

Show HOW MUCH something is true of you, by using the following scale:

1= Not at all like me   2= A little like me   3= Like me   4= Very much like me   5= Exactly like me

1. I enjoy giving parties.
2. Criticism or scolding rarely makes me uncomfortable.
3. I can be comfortable with all types of people—young and old, rich and poor.
4. It takes people quite a while to know me well.
5. My greatest source of pleasure and pain is other people.
6. When I’m with a group of friends, I am often the spokesperson for the group.
7. I love to socialize.
8. I would much rather take part in a political discussion than to observe and analyze what the participants are saying.
9. Sometimes I find it difficult to look at others when I’m talking about something personal.
10. I prefer jobs that require working with a large number of people.
11. I am greatly influenced by the moods of those around me.
12. I am not good at making prepared speeches.
13. At parties I enjoy talking to a lot of different people.
14. There are certain situations in which I find myself worrying about whether I am doing or saying the right things.
15. I find it very difficult to speak in front of a large group of people.
16. I usually take the initiative to introduce myself to strangers.
17. What others think about my actions is of little or no consequences to me.
18. I can easily adjust to being in just about any social situation.
19. When telling a story I usually use a lot of gestures to help get the point across.
20. I’m generally concerned about the impression I’m making on others.
21. Occasionally I’ve noticed that people from different backgrounds seem to feel uncomfortable around me.
22. I consider myself a loner.
23. I often worry that people would misinterpret something I have said to them.
24. I am often chosen to be the leader of a group.
25. I enjoy going to large parties and meeting new people.
26. It is very important that other people like me.
27. I would feel out of place at a party attended by a lot of very important people.
28. I could talk for hours just about any subject.
29. I get nervous if I think that someone is watching me.
30. I am usually very good at leading group discussions.
**APPENDIX E**

*Attachment survey*

*How do you feel in your romantic relationship with your partner? Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Neutral/ Mixed</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-----2------3----4-----5------6------7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I prefer not to show my partner how I feel deep down.
2. At times, I worry about being abandoned.
3. I don’t feel entirely comfortable opening up to my partner.
4. I am concerned that my partner may not care about me as much as I care about him/her.
5. Although I want to get closer to my partner, I oftentimes find myself pulling back.
6. My desire to be very close sometimes scares my partner.
7. I am nervous when my partner gets too close to me.
8. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.
9. I find it difficult to fully allow myself to depend on my romantic partner.
10. When my partner disapproves of me, I tend to feel bad about myself.
11. I tell my partner just about everything.
12. Thinking of not being involved in this relationship, makes me feel a little anxious.
13. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
14. I get frustrated if my partner is not available when I need him/her.
15. I don’t mind asking my partner for comfort, advice, or help.
16. I sometimes resent it when my partner spends time away from me.
APPENDIX F

Self Esteem survey

Please respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it.

Strongly Disagree------------Neutral----------Strongly agree

1  2  3  4  5

I feel that I'm a person of worth at least on an equal basis with others.

I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

I am able to do things as well as most other people.

I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.

I take a positive attitude toward myself.

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

I wish I could have more respect for myself.

I certainly feel useless at times.

At times I think I am no good at all.
APPENDIX G

Sociosexual Orientation Inventory

Please answer all of the following questions honestly. For the questions dealing with behavior, write your answers in the blank spaces provided. For the questions dealing with thoughts and attitudes, bubble in your answer on the scales provided.

1. With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) within the past year? _____________

2. How many different partners do you foresee yourself having sex with during the next year? (Please give a specific, realistic estimate). _____________

3. With how many different partners have you had sex on one and only one occasion? _____________

4. How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current dating partner? (Circle one).
   O Never
   O Once every two or three months
   O Once a month
   O Once every two weeks
   O Once a week
   O A few times each week
   O Nearly every day
   O At least once a day

5. Sex without love is OK.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   O O O O O O O O O

I strongly disagree------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------I strongly agree
6. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.

[Scale 1-9]

O O O O O O O O O

I strongly disagree--------------------------------------------------I strongly agree

7. I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.

[Scale 1-9]

O O O O O O O O O

I strongly disagree--------------------------------------------------I strongly agree
APPENDIX H

_Dating Attitude and Perception survey_

Your relationship status: Single | Dating | Dating | Living | Married
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Not dating | O | O | O | O
Casually | O | O | O | O
Seriously | O | O | O | O
Together | O | O | O | O
Married | O | O | O | O

1) If you are currently involved in a stable relationship, how did you first meet?
Not in a stable relationship | Online | In Person
--- | --- | ---
O | O | O
If online, on what site? _____________________

2) Have you ever used the Internet to meet a potential romantic date? Yes | No
--- | ---
O | O

3) Have you ever used the Internet to meet a potential sexual partner? Yes | No
--- | ---
O | O

4) Have you ever used the Internet to meet a potential romantic partner? Yes | No
--- | ---
O | O

5) Have you ever used an online dating service (i.e., a website created specifically for people to find a romantic date or partner)? Yes | No
--- | ---
O | O

6) Have you ever paid to use an online dating service? Yes | No
--- | ---
O | O

7) In the past 6 months, how many face to face dates do you typically go on per month? (including dates with a stable, casual, or potential romantic partner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) How many face to face dates would you like to go on per month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) In the past 6 months, how many online dates do you typically go on per month? (online dates are planned online meetings to chat exclusively with a person of romantic interest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) How many online dates would you like to go on per month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11) In the past 6 months, on average approximately how much time do you spend online dating per week?

Online dating includes making contact and communicating over the Internet, with a stable, casual, or potential romantic partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 min</th>
<th>0-30min</th>
<th>30min-1hr</th>
<th>1-2hrs</th>
<th>2-3hrs</th>
<th>4-5hrs</th>
<th>5hrs+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) On average approximately how much time would you like to spend online dating per week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 min</th>
<th>0-30min</th>
<th>30min-1hr</th>
<th>1-2hrs</th>
<th>2-3hrs</th>
<th>4-5hrs</th>
<th>5hrs+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) In the past 6 months, how frequently do you use each of the following websites to meet a potential CASUAL SEXUAL partner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once before</th>
<th>A few times before</th>
<th>Once/month</th>
<th>Once/week</th>
<th>Several times/week</th>
<th>Once/day</th>
<th>Several times/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySpace</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat Rooms</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigslist</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingle.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eHarmony</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdultFriend</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finder.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LavaLife.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKCupid</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Live Journal  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  
JDate  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  
Other  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  

(please indicate) ____________________

14) Ideally, how frequently would you *like* to use one or more of the above websites to meet a potential **CASUAL SEXUAL** partner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Once/month</th>
<th>Once/week</th>
<th>Several times/week</th>
<th>Once/day</th>
<th>Several times/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Journal</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDate</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) In the past 6 months, how frequently do you use each of the following websites to meet a potential **ROMANTIC DATING** partner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once before</th>
<th>A few times before</th>
<th>Once/month</th>
<th>Once/week</th>
<th>Several times/week</th>
<th>Once/day</th>
<th>Several times/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySpace</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat Rooms</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigslist</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingle.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eHarmony</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdultFriend</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finder.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match.com</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LavaLife.com O O O O O O O O O O
OKCupid O O O O O O O O O O
Live Journal O O O O O O O O O O
JDate O O O O O O O O O O
Other O O O O O O O O O O

(Please indicate) ____________________

16) Ideally, how frequently would you like to use one or more of the above websites to meet a potential ROMANTIC DATING partner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Once/month</th>
<th>Once/week</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Once/day</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree to each item below using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Using the Internet helps me to connect to people I am not finding on campus
2. I don’t like to date college men/women
3. The people on campus are only interested in sex
4. I don’t think one can find a serious relationship on campus
5. I am looking to date someone older
6. I am too nervous to approach men/women on campus
7. I am too nervous to ask men/women on campus out on a date
8. I fear face-to-face rejection
9. I can prescreen for certain characteristics online
10. I can pretend to be however I want to be online
11. One can find more diversity on the Internet than with the people on campus
12. Online dating is more time efficient than face-to-face dating.
13. With online dating, you can see peoples’ interests ahead of time
14. With online dating, you can look for people who are single to avoid wasting time with people who are in relationships
15. With online dating, you are able to know more about their occupation, if they have kids, where they’re from, etc…
16. I have stereotypes of people I meet in certain places so I’m not interested in people I find there, e.g., meeting people at bars, parties, work etc…
17. I think the Internet is a great place to meet potential partners for sexual contact
18. I think the Internet is a great place to meet dates
19. I think the Internet is a great place to find someone to be in a relationship with
20. I think using the Internet to meet dates is strange
21. I think using the Internet to meet potential partners for sexual contact is strange
22. I think using the Internet to meet someone to be in a relationship with is strange
23. I would CONSIDER using the Internet to meet potential partners for sexual contact
24. I would CONSIDER using the Internet to meet dates
25. I would CONSIDER using the Internet to find someone to be in a relationship with
26. I think online dating is great for people who don’t have enough time to date face-to-face
27. I think online dating is for the socially inept
28. I think online dating is a good alternative if you don’t like the people you have met so far
29. I think using the Internet is a great way to broaden your social group
30. I think using the Internet allows me to meet and have sexual contact with many different men/women at once
31. I think using the Internet allows me to meet and date many different men/women at once
32. Using the internet for dating is beneficial because there is a larger market